



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,526	06/19/2001	David Meeker	07680.0019.00000	2532
22852	7590	03/06/2006	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			CHEN, SHIN LIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1632	

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/884,526

Applicant(s)

MEEKER ET AL.

Examiner

Shin-Lin Chen

Art Unit

1632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6 and 17-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6 and 17-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2-10-06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2-10-06 has been entered.

Applicants' amendment filed 2-10-06 has been entered. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 2-4 and 7-16 have been canceled. Claims 1, 6 and 17-19 are pending and under consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1632

4. Claims 1, 6 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schiffmann et al., January 2000 (PNAS, Vol. 97, No. 1, p. 365-370) or Desnick et al., 1979 (PNAS, Vol. 76, No. 10, pp. 5326-5330) each in view of Ziegler et al., 1999 (Human Gene Therapy, Vol. 10, No. 10, p. 1667-1682) and Selden et al., 1998 (WO 98/11206).

Claims 1, 6 and 17-19 are directed to a method of reducing the accumulation of globotriaosylceramide in a subject having Fabry disease by administering to the subject a viral or non-viral vector encoding a alpha-galactosidase A and subsequently administering to the subject an exogenously produced natural or recombinant alpha-galactosidase A so as to reduce the accumulation of globotriaosylceramide. Claim 6 specifies the alpha-galactosidase A is a recombinant alpha-galactosidase A. Claim 17 specifies the alpha-galactosidase A protein is administered intravenously. Claims 18 and 19 specify the viral or non-viral vector encoding a alpha-galactosidase A is administered ex vivo and in vivo, respectively.

Shiffmann teaches infusing alpha-galactosidase A intravenously into 10 patients with Fabry disease and shows that the alpha-galactosidase A is identified in several cell types in the liver tissue 2 days after the enzyme infusion, and 9 out of 10 patients had significantly reduced globotriaosylceramide levels both in the liver and shed renal tubular epithelial cells in the urine sediment (e.g. abstract). Schiffmann also points out that alpha-Gal A infusions were well tolerated in all patients (e.g. abstract).

Desnick teaches administering splenic or plasma alpha-galactosidase isozyme intravenously into recipient with Fabry disease and shows that after each dose of splenic isozyme the concentration of globotriaosylceramide decreased maximally (50% of initial values) in 15

Art Unit: 1632

minutes and injection of plasma isozyme decreases the concentration of globotriaosylceramide 50-70% by 2-6 hours (e.g. abstract).

Shiffmann or Desnick does not teach combination of natural or recombinant alpha-galactosidase A protein with a vector encoding a alpha-galactosidase A for reducing the accumulation of globotriaosylceramide in a subject with Fabry disease. Schiffmann or desnick does not teach administering a vector encoding alpha-galactosidase A to the subject followed by administering the alpha-galactosidase A protein to the subject.

Ziegler teaches preparation of an adenoviral vector encoding human alpha-galactosidase A (Ad2/CEHalpha-Gal) and injecting said adenoviral vector intravenously into Fabry knockout mice. Ziegler shows that alpha-galactosidase A activity is elevated in all tissues of the injected Fabry mice and significant reduction in GL-3 (globotriaosylceramide) content in all tissues is concomitant with the increase in enzyme activity (e.g. abstract).

Selden teaches that a patient with Fabry disease can be treated with either genetically modified human cells overexpressing and secreting human alpha-gal A (gene therapy) or with purified human alpha-gal A recombinant protein (enzyme replacement therapy) (e.g. p. 2 lines16-32). Selden states some advantages of gene therapy over enzyme replacement therapy, however, Selden states "individuals with alpha-gal A deficiencies may also be treated with purified alpha-gal A (i.e. enzyme replacement therapy)" (e.g. pages 4-5).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the administration of alpha-galactosidase A protein as taught by Shiffmann and Desnick with a vector encoding alpha-galactosidase A as taught by Ziegler to a subject with a Fabry disease because either administration of alpha-galactosidase A protein or administration of

Art Unit: 1632

a vector encoding alpha-galactosidase A can reduce globotriaosylceramide level in a subject with Fabry disease and Selden discusses that both gene therapy and enzyme replacement therapy can be used to treat Fabry disease patient and “individuals with alpha-gal A deficiencies may also be treated with purified alpha-gal A (i.e. enzyme replacement therapy)”. Even if Selden does not specifically points out combination of gene therapy and enzyme replacement therapy for Fabry disease, however, since either administration of alpha-galactosidase A protein or a vector encoding alpha-galactosidase A can reduce globotriaosylceramide level in a subject with Fabry disease, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill to combine alpha-galactosidase A protein and a vector encoding said protein so as to reach greater reduction of globotriaosylceramide level in a subject with Fabry disease. Administration of the alpha-galactosidase A protein before, after, simultaneously, or alternately with a vector encoding alpha-galactosidase A to the subject would be obvious to one of ordinary skill because determining effective schedule of administration is routine optimization of a result-effective variable and is obvious to a person of ordinary skill. Thus, the claimed invention of administering a vector encoding a alpha-galactosidase A followed by administering a alpha-galactosidase A protein to a subject would be *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

One having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to administer a vector encoding a alpha-galactosidase A and subsequently administer an exogenously produced alpha-galactosidase A protein to a subject in order to achieve higher and greater reduction of globotriaosylceramide content in the subject with Fabry disease with

Art Unit: 1632

reasonable expectation of success according to the teachings of Shiffmann, Desnick, Ziegler and Selden.

Applicants cite references Ziegler et al., 2004 and Barbon et al., 2005, and argue that there is an unexpected development of immune tolerance towards the expressed alpha-galactosidase A by using gene therapy in treating Fabry mice and combination of gene therapy first, then enzyme replacement therapy with alpha-galactosidase A protein would have higher overall levels of the administered alpha-galactosidase A than control subject not treated with gene therapy (amendment, p. 4-6). This is not found persuasive because of the reasons set forth above under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection. Both cited references Ziegler and Barbon are about 4 or 5 years **after** the effective filing date of the instant invention, i.e. 6-19-00. One of ordinary skill in the art at the filing of the instant invention would not be aware of the immune tolerance towards the expressed enzyme as reported by Ziegler and Barbon, and such immune tolerance is produced only when a specific AAV vector comprising a liver-restricted enhancer/promoter is used. "Hence, in contrast to the CMV promoter, use of the liver-restricted enhancer/promoter DC190 was associated with a reduced host immune response to the encoded transgene product" (see Ziegler et al., 2004, p. 234, right column, lines 1-4). The specification fails to disclose any unexpected development of immune tolerance towards the expressed alpha-galactosidase A by gene therapy, and to the contrary, the specification (for example, page 8, lines 10-15 and 32-36, page 9, lines 6-11, and page 18, lines 25-36) points out that when gene therapy vector immune response precludes further immediate gene therapy or a gene therapy vector is administered in low dose to avoid immune response, subsequently the enzyme replacement therapy is administered to supplement said gene therapy. It appears that immune response generated by

Art Unit: 1632

gene therapy vector, such as adenoviral vector, was well known in the art at the time of the invention and since both gene therapy and enzyme replacement therapy for Fabry disease by using alpha-galactosidase A were known in the art (for example, the teachings of Shiffmann, Desnick, Ziegler), one of ordinary skill would be motivated to combine gene therapy and enzyme replacement therapy for Fabry disease. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill at the time of filing to practice the claimed invention with reasonable expectation of success according to the teachings of Shiffmann, Desnick, Ziegler and Selden. Further, even if one of ordinary skill in the art is aware of such immune tolerance by gene therapy, such immune tolerance is limited to the use of a specific AAV vector comprising a specific liver-restricted enhancer/promoter. However, the claims encompass using any viral and non-viral vector encoding a alpha-galactosidase for reducing the accumulation of globotriaosylceramide in a subject, the immune tolerance produced by using a specific AAV vector would not be sufficient to render the claimed invention non-obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention considering the teachings of the prior art at the time of filing. Thus, claims 1, 6 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shin-Lin Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-0726. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 am to 6 pm.

Art Unit: 1632

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached on (571) 272-0735. The fax phone number for this group is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

Shin-Lin Chen, Ph.D.



SHIN-LIN CHEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER